

REMARKS

The present communication is responsive to the Official Action mailed April 27, 2011. The claims are amended as indicated above. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Elements Changed in Reissued Parent Application

The Official Action states that claim 1 includes amended elements that were previously amended in the reissued parent application. Specifically, the Examiner notes that, in claim 1, "dieboding" was already changed to "die-binding". In addition, in claims 1 and 2, "encapsulated" was already changed to "encapsulation". Accordingly, these amendments are not being made again.

Claim Rejections for Improper Recapture

Claims 1, 2 and 13-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. The Official Action states that Applicant's response dated September 24, 1993 in Application Serial No. 08/043503 added and argued the patentability of "first thin adhesive layer of about 0.001 inches" for claim 1 and "first thin adhesive layer of about 0.001 to 0.005 inches" for claim 2 to overcome the art rejection dated July 15, 1993. Without conceding the merits of the rejection, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is traversed, as hereinafter set forth.

Claims 1 and 2 were amended to restore the instances of "first thin adhesive layer of about 0.001 inches" for claim 1 and "first thin adhesive layer of about 0.001 to 0.005 inches,"

respectively. Claims 13 and 22 were amended to include "dielectric adhesive elements for securing the carrier and the at least four semiconductor dice in the superimposed relation, wherein each dielectric adhesive element is about 0.001 to 0.005 inches thick," and claim 28 was amended to include "an adhesive on a surface of the carrier, wherein the adhesive is about 0.001 to 0.005 inches thick." Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. for improper recapture is traversed.

Claims 14-21 and 35 depend from claim 13, claims 23-27 depend from claim 22, and claims 29-34 depend from claim 28. As discussed above, claims 13, 22 and 28 are allowable. Thus, claims 14-21, 23-27 and 29-35 are also allowable for at least the same reasons, as well as on their own merits.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the outstanding rejection and allowance of all pending claims.

CONCLUSION

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone Applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 27, 2011

Respectfully submitted,
Electronic signature:
/John J. Farrell/
John J. Farrell
Registration No.: 57,291
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant